



prisoner to file a separate lawsuit. *Id.* at 1198.<sup>1</sup> This court has followed *Hubbard* in numerous cases. *See, e.g.,* Order, *Goins v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, No. 4:12-1924-CMC-TER (D.S.C. Aug. 3, 2012), ECF No. 9; Order, *Stepney v. Leeke*, No. 1:12-1463-JMC-SVH, (D.S.C. June 11, 2012), ECF No. 5; Order, *Blakely v. Hallman*, No. 5:12-1289-TMC-KDW (D.S.C. May 30, 2012), ECF No. 10; Order, *Northrop v. Major*, No. 8:10-2580-RMG-BHH (D.S.C. Oct. 25, 2010), ECF No. 7. Accordingly, the undersigned concludes that the claims of the two Plaintiffs in the instant action should be separated for initial review.

**TO THE CLERK OF COURT:**

This case shall be associated only with the first-named Plaintiff, Phillip Yarbrough. Therefore, the Clerk of Court is directed to remove Dmitry Pronin as a plaintiff in this case and to terminate his Motion to for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* in this action. The Clerk of Court is further directed to assign a separate civil action number to Plaintiff Dmitry Pronin. The Clerk of Court shall file this Order as the initial docket entry in the newly created case and shall re-file the instant Complaint and Plaintiff Dmitry Pronin's Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* as subsequent docket entries in the newly created action. The Defendants in the newly created case will be the same Defendants listed in this case. The Clerk of Court is authorized to determine the most efficient way and time for assigning and entering the new case number, party information, and pleading information on the court's electronic case management system.

After the new case is docketed, the assigned Magistrate Judge is authorized to issue orders pursuant to the General Order issued in *In Re: Procedures in Civil Actions Filed by*

---

<sup>1</sup> A prisoner must also exhaust administrative remedies prior to filing suit for civil rights violations. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a); *Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 85 (2006); *Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516, 524 (2002). Just as payment of one filing fee does not cover multiple plaintiffs under the PLRA, exhaustion of administrative remedies by one prisoner does not meet the exhaustion requirement for all of the plaintiffs.

*Prisoner Pro Se Litigants*, 3:07-mc-5014-JFA (D.S.C. Sept. 18, 2007), and conduct initial reviews in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

November 15, 2016  
Greenville, South Carolina

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge